DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 180 936 SP 014 340

AUTHOR Helder, Keith
TITLE Training Women Teachers: Private Experiments 1820-1840.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 19p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Design; *Educational History; *Educational Philosophy; Humanistic Education; Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education; Teaching Methods; *Women Teachers

ABSTRACT

The changes and developments in the education of women teachers over a period of two decades in the early 18th century in America are examined. Tracing the history of women's education from before the founding of the first Normal School in 1839, changes in attitudes and philosophy are discussed, as well as the social implications of the growth of feminine influence on pupils at the elementary school level. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Keith E. Melder
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED180936

TRAINING WOMEN TEACHERS: PRIVATE EXPERIMENTS 1820-1840

Keith Melder

During the 1830s, as she struggled to obtain an endowment for the female seminary she dreamed of founding, Mary Lyon argued for careful training of women teachers by pointing out that women were the natural instructors of youth. "All our children," she declared, "our future statesmen & rulers, and ministers & missionaries, must come inevitably under the moulding hand of the female, & must experience, through their lives & our country & the world experience with them, the salutary or the bitter effects of this moulding influence."[1] Variations on this argument echoed through 19th-century America, justifying the feminization of teaching and the professional instruction of women teachers. Lyon spoke before the drive to make teaching a women's vocation had taken form, before the establishment of this country's first public normal school in 1839, but after she had more than a decade of personal experience in communicating pedagogical techniques to young women.

Readers of conventional histories are unlikely to be aware that private experiments in teacher-training for women antedated normal schools by about twenty years. Beginning with Henry Barnard in 1851, historians of education wrote as if professional instruction of teachers began with private schools for young men sponsored by New Englanders Samuel Read Hall and James G. Carter in the 1820s. Finally, the traditional account tells us, a combination of private benevolence and public responsibility, guided by the careful political hand of Horace Mann, led to the first public normal schools of Massachusetts in 1839.[2]

SP 014340

A closer examination of less conventional source materials shows quite a different, more lively and complex series of origins for women's teacher-training. Among the chief early promoters of a feminized teaching force were Emma Willard, Catharine Beecher, Joseph Emerson, Zilpah P. Grant, and Mary Lyon.[3]

The context of the movement to train women teachers, although beyond the scope of this brief paper, embraces many elements of 19th-century American culture. First, the recruitment of women was part of the massive evangelical and organizational enterprise known as the Second Great Awakening. As teachers, women were assigned powerful responsibilities for bringing civilization and religious discipline to millions of "heathen" children throughout the Republic. Second, attracting women into teaching helped to aid the rapid development of private secondary schools by justifying the education of daughters, as well as sons, of middle-class families. Third, the training and employment of women in the common schools were essential to the school reformers -- the Horace Manns and Henry Barnards -- of the 1830s and '40s. For women supplied a docile, economical working force to manage the basic level of every school system. Fourth, the encouragement of trained young women to teach was necessary for the professionalization of teaching, and part of a wider development of professional standards and attitudes in the United States. Finally, the assimliation of women into teaching was important for 19th-century women's history, reflecting many national attitudes toward woman's "appropriate sphere," yet helping to upset the status quo. As teachers, thousands of middle-class women received their first experiences as wage-earners outside the household. At the same time they contributed toward what Ann Douglas has recently called "The Feminization of American Culture."[4]

Emma Willard, a pioneer educator of women, conducted influential schools at Middlebury, Vermont, Waterford, and Troy, New York, between 1814 and 1840. Yet Willard's contributions to the formal education of women teachers are seldom emphasized. Her celebrated Plan for Improving Female Education of 1818 boasted of the willingness, utility, and need for training of women teachers. As her program of instruction at Troy Female Seminary matured during the 1820s, she gave increasing attention to developing and communicating systematic pedagogical techniques to her students. About her experiment Willard wrote: "I continued to educate and send forth teachers, until two hundred had gone from the Troy Seminary before one was educated in any public normal school in the United States. Thus early was my system of female education carried into every part of the country, and the school... is fairly entitled to the honor of being the first normal school in the United States."[5]

Another pioneer, Catharine Beecher, toiled and propagandized for more than thirty years to build sentiments and institutions supporting teaching as a kind of holy vocation for women. A masterful recent biography by Kathryn Kish Sklar and modern studies by Barbara Cross and Joan Burstyn provide detailed evidence of Beecher's role chiefly as a promoter and enthusiast of training women teachers. Comparing Willard and Beecher, Sklar writes: "Teaching was in 1830 not a woman's profession. Although Emma Willard had for a decade linked her curriculum at Troy with preparation for a teaching career, Catharine Beecher was the first to envision teaching as a profession dominated by -- indeed exclusively belonging to -- women."[6]

The series of experiements on which I wish to concentrate here occurred during the same time period as the enterprises of Emma Willard and Catharine Beecher. Because their advocates were quieter, more shy of publicity, although no less enthusiastic or effective, their work

has been generally overlooked. Fortunately it is well recorded in the archives of Mt. Holyoke College. These experiments were inspired and intiated by a man, but largely carried forward by his most talented women students. The Rev. Joseph Emerson, a graduate of Harvard College in the class of 1798, taught school before and after his ordination. Apparently more successful as a teacher than a preacher, and frail in health, he decided to make teaching his chief occupation. Emerson's "Seminary for Teachers" opened at Byfield, Mass., in 1818, with the aim of improving the quality of women's education and teacher training. Unlike better-known innovators in teachers' education -- Samuel Read Hall and James G. Carter, who chose to instruct young men -- Emerson concentrated on elevating the standards of pedagogy for women.[7]

Joseph Emerson was no flaming liberal. Although conservative in theology and evangelical in temperament, he called for reform in classroom procedures and demanded that women's intellectual capacities be recognized. His school quickly gained a high reputation for its quality instruction in fundamental subjects -- a contrast to the usual showy accomplishments offered by teachers of women. Emerson articulated his pedagogical philosophy in several obscure publications. His Maxims of Education and Recitation Lectures on the Acquisition and Communication of Thought, among the earliest textbooks of schoolroom practices, are largely informed by common sense and the experiences of a painstaking educator.[8]

Several of his approaches were quite advanced for their time. He urged that subjects be presented in an orderly, graduated fashion. Students learned better by discovering information for themselves instaad of memorizing pre-digested formulas. Emerson encouraged teachers to conduct lively, varied classes. No influence was more important in instructing young people than affection between a teacher and her pupils. Teachers were most effective who cultivated the

emotions of children, gaining their loyalty and making them wish to please. Strong discipline arose not from punishment, but from the natural devotion of pupils to their teachers. The rule of love would replace the rod in Emerson's classroom. His reputation was such that Lyman Beecher, when his daughter Catharine was about to open her Hartford Female Seminary in 1823, advised her to spend enough time at Emerson's school to master his approach to education. The eminent preacher implied that Emerson's school was an exemplar of successful teaching and teacher training.[9]

Emerson's students, Zilpah Grant and Mary Lyon, studied at the Byfield Seminary, and Grant joined him as assistant teacher at Saugus. Emerson helped the two young women to obtain a situation at a female academy at Derry, New Hampshire, but the school there was too frivolous for these sober teachers. Another situation at Ipswich, Mass., offered them more favorable opportunities, and here they moved. After Zilpah Grant became principal of the Ipswich Female Seminary, with Mary Lyon as assistant principal, this school became one of the nation's leading institutions for educating young women.

Between 1828 and 1839 Ipswich Seminary attracted numerous students from all sections of the country, numbering from 120 to 190 in each term, with eight to ten teachers. Their ages varied: the youngest were about 14, but older pupils were sometimes in their twenties with several years of teaching experience behind them. The principal and teachers took on the responsibilities of parents toward their students, maintaining a rigid schedule that left no time for idleness. Discipline was strict, governed by a long and detailed list of regulations over behavior in the classroom, in boarding houses, and in the town.[10] Grant and her assistants, following Joseph Emerson's advice, adhered to the rule of affection, encouraging sympathetic relations between teachers and students.

The Ipswich curriculum consisted of basic essentials. But the subjects taught were all appropriate for women who expected to teach others. English, in the form of grammar, rhetoric, and writing exercises, received heavy emphasis, while advanced arithmetic, geography, U. S. government, history, and basic natural science prepared future teachers for their work. All subjects were judged by the standard of utility and not by their intellectual content. Formal instruction in pedagogical techniques included weekly lectures on teaching and school management, occasional special talks on problems of or approaches to education by visiting experts, and several forms of teaching apprenticeship.[11] Based on their experience as teachers, and having imbibed the "maxims" and philosophy of Joseph Emerson, Zilpah Grant and Mary Lyon offered general advice, not rigid directions or formulas for classroom success. They placed special emphasis on responsibilities of teachers:

> The deep and solemn responsibility which rests upon the teacher... exerts an insensible, but a most effectual influence on his manner of asking questions, communicating information, and giving instruction. It beams forth in the countenance, it shines in the eye, It takes the scholar captive with her will, or against her will. Mind meets mind.... There is a mingling of soul with soul that no words can describe.[12]

In cultivating the emotions and enthusiasm of pupils lay the "key to knowledge." Children's ages, as well as their individual personalities, should be respected. Without using the professional jargon that appeared much later, Zilpah Grant argued that educators take advantage of basic psychological principles in dealing with young people.[13]

Teachers needed a firm grasp of fundamental subjects and a clear plan of presenting basic information in advance of their classes. A major defect of girls' schools in the early 19th century lay in the

overloading of students with so many different branches of study that retention of information became difficult. Zilpah Grant urged her student-teachers to limit the number of subjects considered during a term and pursue them to the point of thorough understanding. But not until fatigue set in; school exercises should be varied, with frequent changes of pace. Young children, in particular, needed frequent times of relaxation and variations in their work. Understanding demanded reinforcement by the development of concepts rather than memorization of words, and the use of classroom objects or devices to illustrate ideas. Review sessions were prescribed to insure retention of knowledge. Learning, the Ipswich pupils discovered, could be made exciting by calling forth a dialogue in the classroom:

> Give scholars the opportunity to bring written questions to the teacher at every recitation, but not propose them orally in the class. Instead of answering these questions directly, let the teacher endeavor to excite, in reference to each of them, a spirit of inquiry in the class, and draw the answer from such of the class as can clearly express the idea, while she herself explains it so as to be adapted to the understanding of the least improved.[14]

Other activities at the Ipswich Seminary contributed to its function and success as a teacher-training institution. Talented older students had opportunities to serve as teaching assistants, assistant pupils, or monitors, and in these capacities they listened to recitations and assisted in the school's management. Thus young women could practice-teach under experienced guidance. The normal school movement would later introduce such practical measures by maintaining "model schools" in which novices could try their skills under classroom conditions. Part of the regular Seminary course was

Isaac Watts popular textbook of educational philosophy and psychology, The Improvement of the Mind, used in many schools and academies.[15]

Both Zilpah Grant and Mary Lyon were enthusiastic about calisthenics (something of a fad in the late 1820s and early '30s), which they recognized as an alternative to dancing, a subject that seemed out of place in a utilitarian course of study. Introduced at Ipswich in 1830, calisthenic exercises had been expanded into three separate series by 1836. Grant considered the system "as a means of pleasant relaxation, and of promoting ease and gracefulness of motion."[16] She also encouraged training in vocal music, permitting one of her assistant teachers to attend an experimental class at Boston conducted by Lowell Mason of the Handel and Haydn Society. On returning to Ipswich, the assistant taught sight-reading and vocal techniques according to Mason's approach. Tunes were sung only after fundamental musical principles had been grasped. Both the assistant teacher and her pupils were delighted with the results.[17]

As the Ipswich Seminary developed, Zilpah Grant and Mary Lyon became increasingly involved with advocating and providing women teachers to other schools. Grant, like her contemporary Catharine Beecher, described teaching as a religious endeavor: "Woman, elevated by the Christian religion, was designed by Providence as the principal educator of our race. From her entrance into womanhood to the end of her life, this is to be her great business."[18] The Ipswich faculty exercised its greatest evangelical influence within the school, over students who went out as educational missionaries.

In her lectures on education Mary Lyon emphasized seven motives for women to teach. The first, "to gain a pecuniary reward," she described as the least important, subsidiary to self-culture, high purpose, service, and sacrifice. Lyon recommended against paying high salaries to women -- an urging little needed in the 19th century.

She also lauded "the privilege of building up on a district school."[19] As its reputation spread, Ipswich Seminary received many applications from school officials who hoped to attract its graduates to their localities, a circumstance which Grant sometimes turned to advantage by reading letters of application to the students.[20] Occasionally visitors to Ipswich from distant places had opportunities to address the young women on the importance of their service as teachers.[21] The success of the principal and her assistant to motivate future teachers is attested to by scores of letters from Ipswich Seminary alumnae, later teachers, in the Mount Holyoke College Archives.

In their work as educational missionaries, Grant and Lyon became involved in the crusade to provide teachers for schools in newly settled regions of the West and South. They corresponded with ministers seeking well-qualified young women to conduct schools and otherwise contribute to the founding of respectable Christian communities in recently settled areas. Competition grew so keen for better candidates that the teachers at Ipswich were hard-pressed to fill all requests they received. They agonized considerably about sending just the right individuals to fill certain positions.[22]

Seeking to extend the benefits of Yankee teachers in the West, Grant and several of the gentlemen who supported her work inaugurated a revolving scholarship fund to assist young women of slight means who wished to become teacher-missionaries. Candidates for aid had to be at least 18 years of age, have "given evidence of piety for at least six months previous," and have more than ordinary promise as teachers. A maximum grant of $200 per student was allowed and successful candidates were expected to repay the fund in order to aid others. The Society was most active for about four years, when it aided 41 young women with a total of just over $4400, of which $2950 was repaid.[23]

Some 88 teachers went from Ipswich Seminary into the Western and Southern states between 1829 and 1839, while approximately 400 others taught in New England and the middle states.[23] Many were employed by or conducted private girls' schools and usually they modeled their programs after that of Ipswich. Of this influence Zilpah Grant wrote: "Many of those who are establishing schools in the Western States & Territories, have so great a preference for teachers educated in Ipswich Sem. that they prefer to delay the commencement of their operations till they can obtain a teacher from this Sem."[24] She could point to the example of Monticello Seminary in Illinois as a school influenced directly by Ipswich principles and staffed by Ipswich graduates. In asking Grant's advice about raising an endowment fund, the school's minister principal wrote, "I <u>think</u> this Institution is already exerting a very great and salutory influence upon this country...."[25] Following the Ipswich pattern, many pioneer seminaries became teacher-training agencies. "Ipswich Sem is in high repute,..." wrote a graduate teaching in Ohio.[26]

In addition to a score or more of young women's seminaries, hundreds of teachers, and thousands of students influenced by their work, the Ipswich Seminary had other descendants. Three schools, now colleges, were patterned immediately after Ipswich: Wheaton in Massachusetts, the young ladies' course at Oberlin, and Mount Holyoke. Several other women's colleges inherited the Ipswich influence indirectly: Lake Erie, Mills, Rockford, and Western College for Women. Each of these schools served in turn as an agency for training women teachers.

The Ipswich system was best represented and carried forward at Mt. Holyoke Female Seminary, the older school's most important direct offspring. Mary Lyon and Zilpah Grant had dreamed of a permanent, endowed boarding school for young women, and had explored alternative

methods to found such an institution. At last, in 1834, Lyon, the more aggressive and healthy of the two, set out on a three-year crusade to raise money for the new school. The Mt. Holyoke story has been ably told elsewhere. For our puposes here, we should remember that one of the new seminary's primary aims was thorough training of women for the vocation of school teaching. Like the Ipswich Seminary, Mt. Holyoke would "advance towards supplying our country with well qualified female teachers," an argument repeated again and again by Lyon as she traveled the highways and byways in search of funds. The school would "prepare ladies to be <u>educators</u> of children and youth, rather than... fit them to be mere teachers, as the term has been technically applied."[27]

In theory Mt. Holyoke Seminary accepted the conventional wisdom about men's and women's social roles. A student's lecture notes probably taken in the 1830s convey Mary Lyon's views concerning "Duties and stations of the sexes." She declared: "Males should go forward in all public duties with courage patience & submission[.] Men are to earn & support, & the women to save[.] It is ridiculous for women to earn money[.] Females must take care of the children & sick[.] Females should be very benevolent, without they are almost monsters[.] A mere intellectual lady is a monster."[28] Despite her disclaimers, however, it seems clear that Mary Lyon self-consciously played a role which she hoped her students would emulate. It may have been this role model that Emily Dickinson remembered after her one year at Mt. Holyoke: "The example of a brilliant and loving woman who had found her work and given her life to it."[29]

In his recent comprehensive biography of Horace Mann, Jonathan Messerli writes that America's first public normal school at Lexington, Mass., had no significant precedents in this country.[30] After looking at the female seminaries -- founded a decade and more before Lexington --

I am inclined to believe that Messerli's argument requires modification. Horace Mann could not help but be aware of the teacher-preparation occurring in female seminaries of New England. Yet given his own prejudices against private academies and Calvinistic religion, he probably found the private seminaries deficient. Normal schools would resolve several problems inherent in the private seminaries: they would reduce the emphasis on evangelical religion, provide public financing and control, and assure that men would have charge of educating women teachers.

We do know that during the late 1830s Horace Mann and other leading male school reformers became enthusiastic about employing women teachers. Indeed, it seemed that women were suddenly discovered by the schoolmen as a sort of untapped natural resource for education. In his revisionist account of this period, The Irony of Early School Reform, Michael Katz describes the arguments favoring the feminization of teaching: "Thus, female teachers... were more appropriate for young children; they were cheaper; they were, amidst the increasing scarcity of men, a necessity. In fact, between 1840 and 1860 the percentage of males teaching school dropped [in Massachusetts] from about sixty to fourteen."[31] But the common school promoters seemed most impressed by the economies made possible by the employment of women teachers.

What had the reformers learned from the female seminaries and enthusiasts such as Zilpah Grant and Mary Lyon? Did they conclude that women would do the dirty work of their profession -- acculturating hordes of unwashed little children -- as a sacrificial duty? Did the schoolmen fear that teachers' seminaries run by women might produce a class of female administrators who would challenge their authority over the new profession? Why did they insist that normal schools replace private seminaries for the training of public school teachers?

There are several methods of approaching these questions. Here I shall borrow from a recent review essay by Ann Douglas to offer a feminist perspective. Douglas speculates on how men and women were responsible for the loss of important rights to women. Perhaps the answer lies in the"process by which male professionals took over nascently professionalized aspects of woman's impulses toward reform, upward mobility and modernization." Douglas notes "the ironic fact that when women try to extend and professionalize their roles they make those roles attractive -- and threatening -- to male professionals." "The unwritten rule... is that woman to date has usually improved her lot as much, if not more, to man's advantage as to her own; her self-improvement has translated into new material for male expertise." By gaining education and becoming professionally competent, woman "has made herself vulnerable to the male expertise which already controls the field. She is accepting preformulated male assignments of educational priorities and capacities, and the male methods of proof and justification; and simply by applying these masculine concepts to her feminist enterprise, she is partly defeated."[32] Here indeed is a challenge to traditional male interpretations of educational reform and progress.

The efforts of early female seminary founders to educate women teachers have been unjustly neglected. Until we know more about their experiments, we can hardly begin to evaluate their contributions -- from a feminist perspective, or as an important phase of education's growth as a profession. My inquiry here has been essentially preliminary and exploratory. In the context of a meeting concerned with educational research -- the opportunities and accomplishments of such research -- let me urge that these early experiments in the training of women teachers be thrust into the mainstream of our concerns.

FOOTNOTES

1. Mary Lyon, "Schools for Adult Females," p. 11, Ms., Mt. Holyoke College Archives.

2. For examples of Barnard's early work, see Henry Barnard, Normal Schools, and Other Institutions, Agencies, and Means Designed for the Professional Education of Teachers (Hartford, 1851), Memoirs of Teachers, Educators, and Promoters and Benefactors of Education.... 2nd. ed., New York 1859), and the American Journal of Education, ed. Henry Barnard, n. s., vol. 13, 1863. The normal school story may be found in Merle Borrowman, ed., Teacher Education in America, A Documentary History (New York, 1965), pp. 19-26; Lawrence A. Cremin, The American Common School, An Historical Conception (New York, 1951), esp. pp. 147-50; David B. Tyack, The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education (Cambridge, 1974), pp. 59-65; Willard S. Ellsbree, The American Teacher: Evolution of a Profession in a Democracy (New York, 1939), pp. 138-54; Herman J. Peters, Collins W. Burnett, Gail F. Farwell, Introduction to Teaching (New York, 1963), pp. 254-5; Paul H. Mattingly, The Classless Profession: American Schoolmen in the Nineteenth Century (New York, 1975), pp. 21-43, ch. 7. Richard M. Bernard and Maris A. Vinovskis, "The Female Teacher in Ante-Bellum Massachusetts," Journal of Social History, March 1977, pp. 332-45, assumes that formal instruction for teachers occurred in normal schools and teachers' institutes. On Samuel Read Hall, see also Claude M. Fuess, An Old New England School, A History of Phillips Academy (Andover, 1917), ch. 11. David B. Tyack criticizes the traditional "house history" of education in "New Perspectives on the History of American Education," The State of American History, ed. Herbert J. Bass (Chicago, 1970), pp. 22-42.

3. Historians of women's education long ago noticed the work of private seminaries in training women teachers: see Thomas Woody, A History of Women's Education in the United States (New York and

Lancaster, Pa., 1929), I, chs. 8-10; Willystine Goodsell, Pioneers of Women's Education in the United States: Emma Willard, Catharine Beecher, Mary Lyon (New York, 1931), pp. 32-3, 38-40, 129-39, 295-7. See also Keith E. Melder, "Woman's High Calling: The Teaching Profession in America, 1830-1860," American Studies, fall 1972, pp. 19-32.

4. Ann Douglas, The Feminization of American Culture (New York, 1977), esp. pp. 76, 104-6; see also Keith E. Melder, Beginnings of Sisterhood: The American Woman's Rights Movement 1800-1850 (New York, 1977), pp. 1-29, 36-7.

5. Quoted in Alma Lutz, Emma Willard, Pioneer Educator of American Women (Boston, 1964), pp. 47-8; Lutz, Emma Willard, Daughter of Democracy (Boston, 1929), is the standard biography.

6. Kathryn Kish Sklar, Catharine Beecher, A Study in American Domesticity (New Haven, 1973), p. 97, pp. 95-8, 113-5, 168-83, 198-203, 221-6; Barbara M. Cross, ed., The Educated Woman in America (New York, 1965), pp. 3-13, 63-79; Joan N. Burstyn, "Catharine Beecher and the Education of American Women," New England Quarterly, Sept. 1974, pp. 386-403.

7. On Emerson's accomplishments, see Ralph Emerson, Life of Rev. Joseph Emerson (Boston, 1834); Harriet W. Marr, "Joseph Emerson, Educator: Early Organizer of Academies in Byfield and Saugus," Essex Institute Historical Collections, July 1953, pp. 197-210; "Mr. Emerson's Female Seminary at Wethersfield, Connecticut," American Journal of Education, Sept. 1826, pp. 543-4.

8. Joseph Emerson, Prospectus of the Female Seminary, at Wethersfield, Ct. Comprising... Maxims of Education, and Regulations of the Seminary.... (Wethersfield, 1826), pp. 15-17, 19-21, Recitation Lectures, Upon the Acquisition and Communication of Thought.... (Wethersfield, 1826).

9. Lyman Beecher to Catharine E. Beecher, March 21, 1823, Ms.,

Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College; Sklar, pp. 53-4; Lucy T. Guilford., comp., The Use of a Life: Memorials of Mrs. Z. P. Grant Banister (New York, 1886), pp. 36-45.

10. Ipswich Seminary Rules, Ms., Mt. Holyoke College Archives; on life and discipline at Ipswich, see American Annals of Education, February 1833, pp. 69-80; M. A. Gillett to Sarah Rowland, July 21, 1832, Ms., Mt. Holyoke College Archives; M. S. Howell to Betsey M. Cowles, February 21, 1835, Ms., Betsey Cowles Papers, Kent State University.

11. Evidence for the character of instruction at Ipswich Female Seminary is taken from the following sources: Zilpah P. Grant Banister, Hints on Education. Extracts from Letters. Written in 1856 (Boston, 1856); Zilpah P. Grant, Maxims for Teachers (n. p., n. d.), described as "directions... given in Ipswich Female Seminary, in a course of instruction on education...."; Asa D. Lord, "Maxims for regulating the conduct, given by Miss Grant, Maxims for Teachers...." Mss. notes on lectures of Miss Grant, ca. 1838, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College Library; Catalogue of the Officers and Members of the Seminary for Female Teachers, at Ipswich, Mass for the Year Ending April 1839 (Salem, 1839), "Appendix," pp. 25-35; Leonard W. Labaree, ed., "Zilpah Grant and the Art of Teaching: 1829, As Recorded by Eliza Paul Capen," New England Quarterly, September 1947, pp. 347-64.

12. Banister, Hints on Education, p. 21.

13. Ibid., p. 12.

14. Grant, Maxims for Teachers, p. 3. This point is discussed in the Seminary's 1839 Catalogue, pp. 30-1.

15. Mt. Holyoke Female Seminary (prospectus, n. p., n. d., ca. 1837), p. 6 (Copy located in Mt. Holyoke College Archives), Banister, Hints on Education, p. 5.

16. Ipswich Seminary, Catalogue... 1839, p. 28; Zilpah P. Grant,

Banister, "Paper on Calisthenics," Ms., Mt. Holyoke College Archives; Asa D. Lord, Maxims...." Mss., Sophia Smith Collection.

17. Maria Cowles to the Rev. Henry Cowles, March 29, 1831, Ms., Mt. Holyoke College Archives.

18. Zilpah P. Grant to Rev. Rufus Anderson, February 23, 1837, Ms., Mt. Holyoke College Archives; See also Banister, Hints on Education, pp. 31-8, for views on educator-missionaries; Catharine E. Beecher to Mary Lyon, October 15, 1834, Ms., Mt. Holyoke College Archives.

19. Bethiah Avery Miller (Nichols?), "Items from Miss Lyon's lectures on education," Ms., Mt. Holyoke College Archives; Labaree, "Zilpah Grant and the Art of Teaching," pp. 361-2.

20. Harriet Hale Johnson to her parents, December 1, 1836, Ms., Mt. Holyoke College Archives. See also Maria Cowles to Rev. Henry Cowles, March 29, 1831, Mt. Holyoke College Archives.

21. Maria Cowles to Rev. Henry Cowles, July 26, 1830, Ms., Oberlin College Archives.

22. Examples of correspondence concerning teacher placement include Mary Lyon to the Misses Stearns and Smith at Chillicothe, Ohio, April 5, 1831, and Mary Lyon to Rev. Charles C. Beatty, Steubenville, Ohio, April 8 and May 23, 1833, typed copies, Mt. Holyoke College Archives. See also "Benefits of Female Education," circular publ. in 1836, pleading for contributions to Ipswich Seminary.

23. "Constitution of the Society for the Education of Females," (n. p., n. d.) located in Mt. Holyoke College Archives. The Society's business is discussed in a resume dated August 1862, a subscription list, its first annual report, and letters from George W. Heard to Zilpah Grant, July 29, and September 6, 1836, all Mss., Mt. Holyoke College Archivees. See also Ipswich Seminary, Catalogue... 1839, p. 35.

24. Zilpah P. Grant, "The Character of Ipswich Female Seminary,"

25. Rev. Theran Baldwin to Zilpah P. Grant, October 7, 1841, Ms., Mt. Holyoke College Archives; see also Mary Cone to Z. P. Grant, May 12, 1838, March 14, 1839, June 10? 1841, Mss; Monticello Seminary, A Junior Eighty-nine Years Old (Godfrey, Ill., ca. 1924).

26. Mary Smith to Zilpah P. Grant, February 17, 1837, Ms., Mt. Holyoke College Archives.

27. Arthur C. Cole, A Hundred Years of Mount Holyoke College, the Evolution of an Educational Ideal (New Haven, 1940), pp. 25, 33.

28. Notes taken by Bethia Avery Miller (Nichols?), a Mt. Holyoke student, n. d., Mss., Mt. Holyoke College Archives.

29. Richard B. Sewell, The Life of Emily Dickinson (New York, 1974), vol. 2, p. 376.

30. Jonathan Messerli, Horace Mann, A Biography (New York, 1972), pp. 323-4.

31. Michael B. Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform (Boston, 1970), p. 58; see also David B. Tyack, "Bureaucracy and the Common School: The Example of Portland, Oregon, 1851-1913," American Quarterly, fall 1967, pp. 475-98, and Melder, "Woman's High Calling." Nancy F. Cott, The Bonds of Womanhood: "Woman's Sphere" in New England, 1780-1835 (New Haven, 1977), pp. 104-8, 115-125, describes arguments for training women. I feel that Cott underestimates the significance of teacher-training as a function of women's education even before 1835.

32. Ann Douglas, review of Woman's Proper Place, by Sheila Rothman, New Republic, January 20, 1979, pp. 25-9.